

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

The Comprehensive Program

Fiscal Year 2001

Deadline for Submission: January 26, 2001

Office of
Postsecondary
Education

Program Information and Application Materials

Introduction

The Comprehensive Program is the central grant competition of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The competition is designed to support innovative reform projects that hold promise as models for the resolution of important issues and problems in postsecondary education.

Several characteristics of the Comprehensive Program make it unique among Federal programs.

- It is *inclusive*. All nonprofit institutions and organizations offering postsecondary education programs are eligible to receive FIPSE grants. Those grants may be in support of any academic discipline, program, or student support service.
- It is *action-oriented*. Although FIPSE will consider proposals to assess existing reforms, or to study the feasibility of reforms in the development stage, it does not ordinarily support basic research. The Comprehensive Program supports a wide range of practical reform initiatives and assists grantees in assessing their results and disseminating what is learned to other institutions and agencies.
- It encourages *bold thinking and innovative projects*. The resources of the Comprehensive Program are devoted to new ideas and practices and to the dissemination of proven innovations to others. FIPSE will support controversial or unconventional projects, as long as they are well justified, carefully designed, and responsibly managed.
- It is *responsive to practitioners*. In its Agenda for Improvement (see following pages), FIPSE identifies common issues and problems affecting postsecondary education and invites applicants to address these *or other* problems imaginatively. The Comprehensive Program welcomes proposals addressing any and all topics of postsecondary improvement and reform.

Awards:

FIPSE estimates that 130 new awards will be made in FY 2001. Grants may provide one, two, or three years of funding. Since Comprehensive Program grants may support improvement projects of varying scope and complexity, there is no minimum or maximum grant award. FIPSE expects to award grants ranging from \$150,000 to \$600,000 or more over a typical three-year period.

Grant budgets will be considered in the context of the proposed project's significance and promise as a model for the reform of American postsecondary education. Fiscal year 2001 projects may begin as early as October 1, 2001 and no later than January 1, 2002. These figures are only estimates and do not bind the Department of Education to a specific number of grants, or to the amount of any grant, unless that amount is otherwise specified by statute or regulations.

Eligibility:

The improvement of postsecondary education requires the participation and cooperation of many types of institutions, organizations, and agencies. FIPSE supports a wide range of *non-profit* providers of educational services. Proposals may be submitted by two- and four-year colleges and universities, both public and private, accredited or non-accredited; graduate and professional schools; community organizations; libraries; museums; trade and technical schools; unions; consortia; student groups; state and local government agencies; non-profit corporations; and associations. Proposals may be submitted by newly formed as well as established organizations, but not by individuals or for-profit schools and organizations. Other organizations may be eligible; the list here is not exhaustive.

Authority:

The Education Amendments Act of 1972 authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to improve postsecondary educational opportunities by providing assistance to educational institutions and agencies for a broad range of reforms and innovations. The specific authority is now contained in Title VII, Part B of the Higher Education Act as amended in 1998 (Public Law 105-244). Regulations are contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34 Part 75. In addition, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 85 apply.

Application Notice:

The official Application Notice is published in the *Federal Register*. The information in the Agenda for Improvement and the rest of this application package is intended to aid in preparing applications for this competition. Nothing in this application package supersedes the priorities published in the *Federal Register*.

FIPSE Address (For information only; do *not* use this address to submit applications.)

FIPSE
8th Floor
1990 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-8544

Telephone: (202) 502-7500
E-mail: fipse@ed.gov

FIPSE World Wide Web Site: For information on past and current projects, successfully evaluated projects from previous years, application information, evaluation resources, and more, visit FIPSE's World Wide Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE>.

Agenda for Improvement

Since its founding in 1972, FIPSE's dual mission has been to improve the quality and the accessibility of education beyond the high school level. This year, in keeping with its past, FIPSE eagerly invites creative ideas to ensure that as many students as possible enter and successfully complete postsecondary programs of high quality.

The central challenge, common to postsecondary institutions of all sizes and types, is to provide cost-effective learning opportunities for a larger and more diverse student population. This Agenda highlights some of the important issues accompanying this challenge, and we specifically encourage proposals that address these issues. But we recognize that the Agenda does not identify all the important problems and opportunities facing the postsecondary community. FIPSE welcomes proposals addressing important issues of access and quality not discussed in the Agenda for Improvement; the Agenda is intended to stimulate but not limit the thinking of potential applicants.

The Importance of Innovation

FIPSE grants are intended to provide the seed capital for experiments in educational reform, and the knowledge gained through those experiments should be intended to benefit postsecondary students throughout the country. Are the problems or opportunities you wish to address common to other institutions serving similar student populations? If so, can you design an educational reform project that demonstrates to others an effective new way of responding to those problems? FIPSE's goal is to support implementation of innovative reform ideas, to evaluate how well they work, and to share the lessons learned with the larger postsecondary education community.

Project Summaries

The margins below contain brief summaries of some recent FIPSE projects, offered to suggest the wide range of possible responses to the issues described in the Agenda for Improvement. The summaries are taken from longer descriptions prepared by project directors for FIPSE's Program Book, available online at <http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE>.

As a potential applicant, one of the first things you should do is to investigate how others are responding to similar problems or opportunities. How does your idea compare to common or traditional educational practice? More importantly, how does it compare to the experiments of other leading-edge educational reformers? Your project should be designed to make a unique contribution to the professional community. It does not necessarily have to be a revolutionary or paradigm-shifting reform model, but it should be a significant next step.

Access, Retention, and Completion

FIPSE encourages educators at all institutions to propose new ways of ensuring access to postsecondary education. But access alone is not enough; the greatest benefits for both students and society depend on successful completion of academic programs. Improvements in rates of retention and program completion are therefore vitally important, especially for low-income and minority students whose success rates continue to lag behind those of other groups.

As the world economy becomes more competitive, increasing demand for a workforce that is capable of dealing with complex problems and sophisticated technologies, postsecondary education cannot be a luxury or a privilege. Rather, some form of it should now be seen as a necessity for nearly every student's future well-being. FIPSE therefore solicits proposals that recognize this need and pay particular attention to groups that historically have not had equal access to postsecondary education. FIPSE is eager to help support and disseminate imaginative access and retention strategies for these students, including projects at institutions that have long experience in serving underrepresented students, and projects to develop in faculty a special understanding of the challenges these students face.

The access and retention of students who are older, working, and caring for children also require special attention. Research studies confirm that involvement in campus communities strongly correlates with student retention and completion. But commuting and adult students, facing commitments away from the academic and social life of the campus, find it difficult or impossible to participate in traditional residential campus activities. FIPSE welcomes proposals to experiment with new ways of engaging nontraditional students in communities of learners.

As a majority of college entrants now begin at community colleges, it is crucial that educators focus their attention on these institutions, both as sources of quality liberal arts, technical and vocational programs that are ends in themselves and as gateways to further postsecondary education. This makes retention, completion, and transfer rates at community colleges especially significant. Consequently, FIPSE encourages proposals to improve community colleges' academic and career programs, counseling, articulation with four-year colleges, and support of candidates for transfer.

Many institutions have had success with distance education programs designed to improve access. As a result, students in nearly every region of the country now have additional, if limited, academic options. FIPSE invites proposals that promise to expand the range of academic choices available to distant students while preserving the academic quality and elements of on-campus learning that have been tied so clearly to student success. We particularly encourage collaboration among institutions and systems in distance learning, with the expectation that economies of scale will make the necessary investments in technology, curriculum and materials development, and faculty training more cost-effective. We specifically invite institutions that are committed to distance education to propose innovative models to improve student support services, and to explore new ways to involve distant students in communities of learners.

Brevard Community College Cocoa, Florida

"The Virtual Campus Project"

Brevard is a multi-campus college serving students in a large suburban area. As one response to changing student needs, demographics, and lifestyles, Brevard implemented the Virtual Campus project in 1995. The Virtual Campus is a computer-simulated, online campus environment in which students who were previously unable to commute to campus can access many aspects of a college education, including degree programs, student support services, and a variety of student activities. Faculty are collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and technical staff to design curricula, revise institutional policies, and develop innovative teaching techniques that optimize student learning. To assist other institutions that are, or plan to be, involved in online distance learning, Brevard's dissemination plan includes presentations at national education and distance learning conferences, online availability of project materials, and a satellite videoconference.

**Miami University
Oxford, Ohio**

**"Increasing Expectations for
Academic Effort"**

The 1994 *Involvement in Learning* report identified three critical conditions of excellence in under-graduate education: student involvement, assessment and feedback, and high expectations. While involvement and assessment have since received considerable attention from the postsecondary community, little attention has been paid to increasing expectations of student effort. This project aims to develop better ways of measuring levels of expectations for student effort and to identify campus practices that support high expectations. The project is a collaborative effort involving six Midwestern campuses that mirror in part the diversity of American higher education.

**Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts**

**"The Academic Common
Experience"**

Northeastern, a large, complex university with seven colleges offering a range of undergraduate liberal arts and professional degrees, has developed a new model for undergraduate education that assumes neither a campus-wide core curriculum nor a distribution requirement. Instead, the Academic Common Experience fully integrates general education into the major program. Faculty in major subjects are being asked to design curricula that fulfill a set of general education goals centered on: effective thinking and communication skills; information literacy; life management and personal skills; natural and social/cultural world contexts; development of historical, ethical, aesthetic, and personal perspectives; and drawing connections between academic study and work experiences. Evaluation of both student learning and programmatic success has been built

Another problem of continuing concern to FIPSE is the limited participation of underrepresented groups in graduate study in the academic disciplines. Unless more members of these groups enroll in graduate programs and complete degrees, their current under-representation on college faculties can only continue, with negative impact on the performance and retention of all students. FIPSE welcomes proposals that promise to increase the access, retention, and completion rates of graduate students, as well as proposals to encourage those with graduate degrees to enter the postsecondary teaching profession.

Improving Campus Climates for Learning

FIPSE welcomes proposals to improve campus climates for learning by creating an environment that is safe, welcoming, and conducive to academic growth for all students.

Some obstacles to learning have little to do with skills or motivation, and much to do with civility and respect for others. Racial and cultural minorities, for example, may feel alienated from the majority student culture, even when not experiencing overt forms of prejudice. Many women continue to experience the chilly climates documented by FIPSE grantees over a decade ago. On some campuses, subcultures such as fraternities may themselves have an adverse effect on the academic life of students.

Another disturbing trend affecting environments for learning is the increase of crimes and violence on many campuses. FIPSE is particularly interested in projects to implement educational programs for students and faculty, and projects for administrators that utilize model administrative procedures and practices for dealing with these issues.

FIPSE welcomes proposals to address campus climate issues in creative ways. Applicants should be explicit about the behavioral changes they seek, how those changes will be evaluated, and how they will positively affect retention and other learning outcomes.

Curricular and Pedagogical Reform

FIPSE will continue to support innovative reforms of undergraduate, graduate, and professional curricula. We seek applicants proposing lasting transformations not only of what students learn but also how they learn. Proposed model programs should include a rigorous assessment of their impact on student learning. And they must be cost-effective and sustainable, for both the applicant institution and for others seeking similar solutions.

Core Requirements and General Education: One area of the undergraduate curriculum that requires continuing attention is the core or general education curriculum, typically comprising about one-third of bachelor degree course work. At their best, such curricula can translate lofty institutional mission statements into concrete programs for student academic development. But a proliferation of course offerings and lack of requirements, in the absence of clear educational goals, threatens to reduce general education to a freshman and sophomore year elective program. Conversations with students on many campuses suggest that students have little idea what general education is

**University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island**

**"A Model for the International
Exchange of Students in
Engineering and Business"**

Students in professional programs often find their study abroad opportunities limited by strict curricular requirements on their home campuses, differing curricula in other nations, and insufficient attention to second-language acquisition. The intense globalization of the world economy, however, has made it increasingly important that students in business and technology fields be trained to interact more effectively with counterparts throughout the world. Rhode Island's model, developed in collaboration with Technische Universität Braunschweig in Germany, incorporates several distinctive features, including: intensive language and culture programs for both students and faculty participants; long-distance tutoring via e-mail to familiarize future exchange students with each other and their respective universities; and extensive use of the Internet to facilitate student support services.

intended to accomplish, and hence no real basis for choosing a portfolio of general education courses. FIPSE welcomes proposals to make the goals of general education clear, and to guide and link course choices so that general education can serve its true purposes.

The Sciences: In recent years educators in mathematics, the sciences, humanities, and many professional fields have implemented a number of learner-centered reforms in both content and pedagogy, particularly at the introductory levels of their disciplines. Transformation in the social sciences has been slower, but is no less necessary. FIPSE encourages faculty in all disciplines to examine opportunities for rethinking curricular organization and content, as well as revolutionizing teaching techniques, at every level. Is it possible, for example, that the traditional organization of learning into "courses" will no longer be appropriate for learner-centered instruction in the coming century?

Education for Careers: It is increasingly important that curricula in all disciplines include preparation of students for the workplace. Because the United States is the only industrialized nation that does not have a formal apprenticeship system for helping young people make the initial transition from school to work, postsecondary institutions must join with employers and others in the development of other models for integrating work and learning, at all levels of education. Some may choose to explore innovations that build on existing models of cooperative education, tech-prep, or clinical programs. Others might try new adaptations of apprenticeship or internship models to be designed and managed cooperatively with employers. Such programs should ensure that students acquire the academic skills necessary for success now and in the future. In order to accomplish this objective, it may be necessary to define general academic competencies appropriate to a particular degree, and to expect students to master these in addition to meeting the occupational skills standards currently under development nationwide.

International Education: FIPSE encourages proposals spanning a broad range of international education topics and concerns. Fundable projects would view postsecondary education in a worldwide arena, which has become increasingly more connected. Proposed projects would clarify the ends and purposes of professional and academic areas of study within the global marketplace; create or renew academic, vocational, or professional curricula in international education; and assess the effectiveness of innovative courses, programs, or curricula within an international environment which requires a more concerted effort to meet educational challenges. Proposals are welcomed for projects which seek novel strategies for dealing with the international dimension of issues related to all aspects of postsecondary education, including foreign language acquisition, the social sciences, health sciences, and information technology.

In recent years, FIPSE has sponsored special competitions to link U.S. institutions with those in the European Union, Mexico, and Canada. Outreach to other parts of the world such as South America, Africa, and Asia is no less important, and FIPSE will continue to support such initiatives through the Comprehensive Program.

Second Language Acquisition: Students learn a second language for a variety of personal and professional reasons. FIPSE is particularly interested in

proposals which create curricula that reflect students' varying goals in learning a foreign language, and which seek to take advantage of both classroom and nontraditional learning environments. Applicants might, for example, wish to explore new ways of teaching language and cultures in disciplinary contexts; to work with language acquisition specialists to create new learning materials that can be used both inside and outside the classroom; to develop educational materials that students can use beyond their college years as part of a lifelong language acquisition strategy; to provide students with opportunities to use their foreign language skills in practica or internships within a heritage language community in the United States; to experiment with computer conferencing and other distance technologies to link students across national borders in conversations and problem-solving; or to increase access to study abroad and international internships. The greatest gains in foreign language acquisition come when students begin at an early age, and applicants may wish to explore greater collaboration in languagetraining between school districts and postsecondary institutions. Similarly, applicants may wish to investigate collaborations between postsecondary institutions and heritage language schools, or collaboration with the foreign language centers sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Center for International Education.

Technology and the Curriculum: Finally, we note the enormous potential of technology to advance curricular reform in these areas and many more. FIPSE will continue to support efforts to develop cost-effective technology-mediated materials that promise to improve teaching and learning in and across the various disciplines. But applicants should note that many valuable materials, already developed and tested on campuses across the country, receive only isolated use because they have not been effectively disseminated to others. Applicants are therefore encouraged to conceive from the beginning of their projects better ways to share materials and expand pilot testing to other institutions. We particularly encourage proposals from faculty, disciplinary associations, and other professional communities to explore collaborative development of technological resources that have potential for wide application, to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of those resources in improving instructional quality, and to disseminate them to other interested practitioners through electronic media and other means.

The Power of Distributed Learning Technologies: Instructional technology is now being used for purposes that extend curricular and pedagogical reform beyond traditional classroom settings. For example, the growth of distance learning has proved that the classroom itself can be a virtual construct, enabling students to enroll in courses despite being remotely located from the institutions offering instruction. One of the great challenges to educators has been to use technology in ways that make student-faculty contact, communication with other learners, and engagement in problem-solving or other types of interactive learning as rich as in a good traditional classroom. This challenge is still relevant, especially now with the rapid growth in internet-based distance education.

We are now finding that even students enrolled in residential campus programs are interested in enrolling in distance education courses, using the online student services that are being developed for distance learners, and accessing resources far beyond those found in the local library. The lines between distance education and campus-based learning seem gradually to be blurring. Whether targeting remote distance learners or campus-based learners,

**Dickinson College
Carlisle, Pennsylvania**

**“A Consortial Approach to
Controlling College Costs”**

In an effort to confront fundamental issues involved in reducing college costs and stabilizing tuition, the colleges of the Central Pennsylvania Consortium (Dickinson College, Franklin & Marshall College, Gettysburg College, and Bucknell University) have created a joint entity to run selected business functions. Over a two-year period, this project will organize and implement a demonstration project which can meet institutional needs and serve as a model for other private colleges that are faced with the challenge of controlling costs and finding creative ways to reduce their historic dependence on tuition increases as the primary solution to maintaining balanced operating budgets. Five functional services in the corporate operations of the individual colleges have been identified as areas where collaborative efforts might yield cost savings: personnel, auxiliary services, contracted services, computing and technology, and selected business functions. It is anticipated that shared services of specialized personnel, economies of scale in volume purchasing of goods and services, and efficiency of shared training activities will lead to cost savings in the operating budgets of the respective institutions. Assessment of the project will be continuous, with internal and external evaluations to review new management practices and to analyze results in terms of efficiency and cost reduction. It is expected that the model developed from the project will be adaptable to other consortia around the country.

applicants planning to use distributed learning technologies should seek to create solutions that are portable across institutions, and scalable to large numbers of students and institutions. Special attention should be paid to the incentives and rewards necessary for faculty to develop and implement new technology-based teaching strategies, to author professional-quality distributed learning resources, and to collaborate with others -- including non-teaching staff and representatives of industry or other relevant sectors. Some heretofore unquestioned assumptions about the roles of teaching faculty, the length of the academic term, the measurement of student progress, or other factors may have to be re-examined.

Applicants specifically interested in asynchronous, online distance education may wish to apply to the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships (LAAP) program, another grant competition administered by FIPSE. (For information, see application materials at <http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE/LAAP>.) LAAP, however, only funds consortial partnerships that are devoted to “anytime anywhere distance learning” and are national or regional in scope. Many distance learning projects are still better suited to the Comprehensive Program. If you have questions, please consult a program officer.

Controlling Costs: Making More Productive Use of Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning

Postsecondary education is being challenged to reexamine its traditional methods of operation in order to achieve necessary cost-efficiencies while maintaining and improving quality. FIPSE encourages proposals to redesign courses, programs, departments, institutions, and systems to refocus critical resources on teaching and learning and make those resources pay increased dividends in student learning.

In 1998, in response to concerns expressed in Congress and among the public, FIPSE conducted a special competition focused on controlling costs in postsecondary education. In the light of the postsecondary community’s strong response to that competition, FIPSE again invites applications for support of demonstration projects in postsecondary cost control through the Comprehensive Program. For the purposes of this competition, “postsecondary education cost control” will mean the following: reducing the total amount that is actually spent by a postsecondary institution to bring a given number of students up to the level of postsecondary knowledge and skill that was achieved by comparable groups in previous years; or lowering the annual rate of increase of such costs significantly below its previous level.

For example, postsecondary cost control would include reducing the amount that is spent by University X on human resources, facilities, and equipment to bring a hundred freshmen with a certain level of preparation, ability, and motivation to the same level of understanding of calculus that was achieved by comparable groups in earlier years. Further, it would include holding the annual percentage increase in the cost of bringing such students to this level of understanding of calculus below the rate of previous years. For example, if the amount spent to bring similar groups to this level has typically increased by 6% from year to year, holding future annual increases to 3% would count for the purposes of this competition as controlling costs.

In short, FIPSE seeks to support reforms that yield the same or more education per student for fewer dollars, or at least for a smaller than usual annual percentage increase in dollars. Awards will be made for projects that depart from familiar strategies for cost control and seem likely to improve upon them, rather than for the replication of already common practices. To ensure that reviewers appreciate the innovativeness of proposed projects, applications should include a review of practices around the country that are most similar to those being proposed, mentioning examples, and explain how the proposed project would differ from these. Grant applications under this topic should show careful attention to measures of financial and educational impact. The difficulties of measuring educational outcomes and costs are well known, and FIPSE does not intend to set unrealistic standards of rigor. Nevertheless, applicants need to define very clearly what they will count as evidence that educational outcomes held constant or improved while real costs fell or rose more slowly than usual. Because the state of the art of measuring the real costs of postsecondary instruction is not very advanced, particular attention should be given to this issue.

**California State University,
Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California**

"Project LEAP²"

As increasing numbers of underprepared native-born, immigrant, and international language minority students enter postsecondary education, faculty need assistance in dealing with the instructional demands of this burgeoning student population. Project LEAP² is a three-year development effort to train faculty at California State University, Los Angeles, other CSU campuses, and institutions nationwide to integrate language and content instruction in courses across the disciplines and thereby improve the academic literacy of language minority students. This project builds on the original Project LEAP, a successful FIPSE-supported project in which selected general education courses known to be linguistically and conceptually challenging were enhanced with a language development focus.

It is FIPSE's practice to identify priorities and invite the field to come forward with its own strategies, rather than to prescribe strategies. Accordingly, applicants are encouraged to consider a variety of possible responses to these challenges, such as consolidation of general education offerings; reduction of credits required for a degree; reduction of duplicate course offerings within and between institutions; use of pedagogies that make students more responsible for their own progress and less dependent on faculty; appropriate uses of educational technology; and the sharing of resources by institutions connected by geography or mission. Innovative projects to develop new models of faculty service -- particularly those addressing appropriate balance among faculty responsibilities; connections between student learning and faculty rewards; or alternatives to traditional systems of promotion, tenure, and faculty review -- are also encouraged. FIPSE will support other curricular, pedagogical, and administrative improvements that hold promise to serve as models for other institutions.

Faculty Development

FIPSE seeks to support the professional development of full- and part-time faculty by assessing and rewarding effective teaching; promoting new and more effective teaching methods; and improving the preparation of graduate students who will be future faculty members.

At many institutions, teaching is undervalued because rewards systems and peer pressures favor research rather than a reasonable balance between these functions. Therefore, projects that encourage research-oriented departments and institutions to support and reward teaching excellence and to reduce the tension in the lives of faculty between their teaching and research responsibilities are especially welcome. It will be easier for institutions to emphasize and reward good teaching, however, if better ways can be found to assess and document the work faculty do in the service of students and the community. FIPSE therefore encourages proposals to develop models of performance reporting.

Strong evidence reported in Alexander Astin's study *What Matters in College?* (Jossey-Bass, 1993) supports the view that faculty involvement with students and active, self-directed learning by students contribute more than anything else to measurable student success. Therefore, FIPSE seeks projects to introduce teaching and learning methods that support student-faculty interaction, learning communities and other collaborative learning models, active and "hands-on" student participation, and the development and use of technological innovations that further these ends.

The most effective initiatives to train faculty in the use of educational technology have been those which explicitly connect that training to specific instructional improvements, to departmental and institutional priorities, and to the institution's developing technological infrastructure. FIPSE encourages the development of improved training models with these components, particularly those, which aim to measure their success in improving student learning outcomes.

FIPSE also has a special interest in projects which develop the teaching abilities of both graduate students who are preparing for future careers in the professoriate, and adjunct faculty who teach an increasing number of courses at institutions throughout the country. We acknowledge both the enormous contributions to teaching made by skilled adjuncts and the economic considerations that have led many postsecondary institutions to rely so heavily on their services. We suggest that such reliance carries a concomitant responsibility to involve adjunct faculty more intensely in campus communities, and to offer them meaningful opportunities for professional development.

**Baylor College of Medicine
Houston, Texas**

**"Creating Global Classrooms via
Information Technology"**

The focus of this project is on providing opportunities for school teachers in South Texas to learn how to use the information technology equipment in their classrooms and apply it to produce new learning conditions and outcomes for the largely Hispanic student population of that area. Discipline-specific teacher teams jointly plan technology applications and cooperative instructional strategies for various content areas, with the assistance of the project's full-time, on-site instructional technology specialist, during a daily 90-minute planning period. The unique setting for the project, in a secondary school (grades 7-12) for aspiring teachers, maximizes the project's impact by involving not only current teachers but a cohort of future teachers as well.

Improving K-12 Teaching and Schools

Postsecondary education has an obvious self-interest in the quality of preparation it provides to the nation's schoolteachers, because today's school pupils are tomorrow's college and university students. FIPSE therefore invites postsecondary institutions to propose new models for the preparation of K-12 teachers.

Teacher Education: FIPSE will support innovative programs to ensure that future school teachers have, first, a sound general education -- one that combines knowledge of important facts with the conceptual frameworks needed to understand and interpret those facts -- and, second, mastery of the academic disciplines they intend to teach. Earlier FIPSE projects directed at these goals have included curriculum reform at universities that traditionally graduate large numbers of teachers, the establishment of teacher-preparation programs at liberal arts colleges, and efforts to help professionals in other fields take up second careers in teaching. Applicants are encouraged to propose new variations on these strategies and more novel strategies to improve teacher preparation in all subject areas.

Improving the teaching of mathematics and reading is particularly important. In the recent "Third International Mathematics and Science Study" (TIMSS), U.S. fourth graders scored above the international average in mathematics, but U.S. eighth graders scored below the international average. By way of explanation, the study reported that American school teachers have more years

of college education than those in all but a few of the 41 nations participating in the study, yet the math curriculum they teach is both less focused and less challenging than that taught in high-achieving nations such as Japan and Korea. Moreover, American teachers typically stress computational procedures rather than mathematical thinking and a deep understanding of mathematical concepts.

These results can be attributed in part to the collegiate preparation of elementary and middle school teachers of mathematics and the divided responsibility of departments of mathematics and schools of education for that preparation. Many of these future teachers take just a few credit hours of math through college mathematics departments. Moreover, these courses generally are not designed for prospective teachers, do not cover the mathematical content that elementary and middle school teachers teach, and do not model the instructional methods needed to present challenging mathematics to elementary and middle school students.

**College Entrance Examination
Board
New York, New York**

**"Making Connections in Foreign
Language Instruction"**

The Making Connections Project is a dissemination initiative of an earlier, FIPSE-supported Articulation and Achievement Project, a three-year collaborative endeavor of the College Board, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and the New England Network of Academic Alliances. The project identified learning outcomes and classroom-based assessments for the critical transitions between middle school and high school, and between secondary and postsecondary education. The project also developed a coherent, sequenced, and articulated continuum for foreign language instruction and learning in grades 7-14 for the most commonly studied languages.

In response, FIPSE welcomes proposals for college mathematics courses, programs, or other innovations that will help future elementary and middle school math teachers master the content they will be asked to teach deeply enough to be able to engage their students in higher level mathematical learning. With university leadership, such a course or program would build on partnerships between math departments, schools of education, and the schools.

Strategies to improve the reading skills of America's youth are no less important. In addition to improvements in the preparation of teachers of reading, innovative proposals to involve parents, the community and collegiate tutors in innovative projects outside the school to reinforce these skills are encouraged.

Partnerships with Schools: Earlier FIPSE grantees have built numerous efforts to improve student performance in college on the strategy of forming partnerships between K-12 and postsecondary institutions and educators. This idea continues to have potential. Partnerships which promise parity in obligations, opportunities, and rewards are especially welcomed, as are those that involve faculty from a variety of disciplines. The deliberate articulation of curriculum between educational stages is one very promising strategy, helping students to avoid those gaps, repetitions, and arbitrary shifts in nomenclature and perspective that so often hamper students' progress as they move from school to postsecondary institutions, and from two-year institutions to four-year ones.

FIPSE also has supported the articulation of student learning outcome assessments, especially in the area of foreign language, and related improvements in the college admissions and placement processes. Proposals offering new visions of partnership between K-12 and postsecondary education that hold promise for systemic reform will be welcomed.

FIPSE also invites proposals addressing the retention and professional development of talented in-service teachers. Opportunities to develop expertise with the newest instructional technologies and to work directly with academic specialists at the university level are especially needed. The identification of national achievement standards for students in the various subjects and the

growth of the charter school movement also have numerous implications for the professional development of teachers, not to mention school administrators.

**The Evergreen State College
Washington Center for
Undergraduate Education
Olympia, Washington**

**"Learning Communities
Dissemination Project"**

For the past twelve years, the Washington Center for Undergraduate Education has supported the development of learning communities. These approaches to curricular reform purposely restructure the curriculum to thematically link or cluster courses and enroll a common group of students, and have proven to be powerful factors in increasing student engagement, retention, and intellectual development. They also offer important opportunities for faculty development. Established to serve campuses in Washington, the Center has built a strong network of learning community expertise in that state. Many promising learning community programs have been discussed or initiated in other states as well, and their proponents have relied on the Washington Center for needed advice. In response, the Center obtained a FIPSE grant for a national dissemination project focused on strengthening and sustaining these incipient programs. The Center is working closely with twenty-one campuses as they more fully establish, assess, and evaluate their learning community programs. The experience and knowledge gained by these institutions will be featured in a national conference in the final year of the grant project.

Dissemination of Successful Innovations

Recognizing that many innovative programs have already been locally developed, implemented, and evaluated, FIPSE invites proposals to disseminate these innovations to other institutions.

Postsecondary education has been notoriously slow to learn from its own successes. How can this be changed? Clearly, new models of dissemination, innovative ways to make innovation self-sustaining, realism about costs and benefits to both originators and adapters -- all are needed to bring about lasting change. FIPSE welcomes proposals to disseminate particularly successful reform initiatives, whether or not they were originally developed with FIPSE support. As in the past, dissemination proposals will be judged on the significance of the original innovation, the quality of the evidence supporting its success at the originating institution, its potential for adaptation elsewhere, and the readiness of proposed adapters. This means that an applicant must have completed a thorough evaluation of the project in question.

FIPSE thinks of dissemination as transfer of both knowledge and strategies. Applicants should plan to go beyond information exchange to develop sustainable liaisons between originating and adapting sites to sustain new project demonstrations. And, as in all FIPSE-sponsored dissemination projects, the dissemination effort itself should include a multi-site evaluation plan encompassing the mentoring site and all potential adapting sites.

In the standard "hub and spokes" approach to dissemination, originators seek adapters for their innovations and provide training and ongoing implementation assistance. In its best form, this model is effective for those programs that are focused, specific to individual units or programs, and amenable to comparatively quick implementation. Successful originators of innovative ideas have learned that their efforts yield the strongest and most lasting results when: originators and adapters understand that the original model must be adapted to the particular circumstances of the new environment; those wishing to adapt the reforms are ready to take action; the adapter has the opportunity to see the program in action and talk with those who have been involved in it; and systematic contact between the originating institution and the adapting sites is extended over a period long enough to permit extensive coaching. FIPSE's experience with dissemination projects has confirmed these principles. It also suggests that the most successful dissemination projects occur when the originators of the innovation have developed substantial documentation of program strategies and processes that can be used by adapters, and when originators are proactive in communicating regularly with adapting sites to sustain and support their progress.

FIPSE recognizes that effective dissemination strategies may deviate from this model. For example, an alternative model might shift the locus of control from the originating institution to the adapting sites. In this model, a partnership of adapting sites applies for a FIPSE grant and engages an originating institution to provide assistance to them. This approach has the advantage of allowing

adapters the flexibility to identify from among a number of validated innovations those most closely addressing their needs.

FIPSE welcomes these and other creative approaches to the dissemination of successful programs. Invited are proposals that would increase the number of institutions engaged in reform initiatives. Also of interest are proposals that would demonstrate how the impact of a reform might be expanded by having each of several adapting institutions scale up its level of activity. Applicants are encouraged to visit the FIPSE website to examine reports of previously funded dissemination projects that achieved their goals and to consult with a FIPSE program officer before submitting their proposal.

Other Fiscal Year 2001 FIPSE Competitions*

Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships

FIPSE plans to make grants to support partnerships among colleges and universities, employers, technology companies, and other relevant organizations to create postsecondary programs on a national or regional scale that deliver distance education anytime and anywhere.

Guidelines Available: TBA

Application Deadline: TBA

Schedule uncertain at the time of this publication.

European Community/United States of America Joint Consortia for Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training

FIPSE and the European Commission's Directorate General for Education and Culture plan to make jointly grants to facilitate the formation of educational consortia of American and European institutions. The consortia will be organized to promote educational collaboration and student exchange.

Guidelines Available: TBA

Application Deadline: TBA

Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education

FIPSE plans to make grants to facilitate the formation of trilateral consortia of institutions from the U.S., Mexico, and Canada to develop joint curricula and promote student exchange.

Guidelines Available: TBA

Application Deadline: TBA

US-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program

FIPSE and Fundação Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal Nível Superior (CAPES) of the Brazilian Ministry of Education plan to make jointly grants to facilitate student exchange within the context of bilateral curricular development. Students will benefit from having an international curriculum and cultural dimension added to their studies.

Guidelines Available: November 17, 2000*

Application Deadline: March 30, 2001*

NOTE: Separate competitions for **Controlling the Cost of Postsecondary Education** and **Disseminating Proven Reforms**

(both last held in FY 1998) will not be held in FY 2001. Applications on these topics should be directed to the Comprehensive Program.

*This information is tentative. Actual competitions and deadlines will be announced in the *Federal Register* and in the application guidelines. Guidelines can be requested from ED Pubs by telephone (toll free) at 1-877-433-7827 or fax at (301) 470-1244. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call (toll free) 1-877-5766-7734. All publications are free. Application materials for all competitions can also be downloaded from FIPSE's website:
<<http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE>>.

Guide to Proposal Development¹

This discussion is intended to help you conceive and write a stronger proposal by alerting you to the ways in which it will be read and judged. We recognize that some of the considerations raised here may not pertain to your particular project, and the following remarks are not intended to oblige you to organize your proposal around direct responses to all of them.

Before You Prepare an Application

Because of FIPSE's broad eligibility criteria and expansive programmatic interests, the Comprehensive Program receives a large number of preliminary proposals each year. The preliminary proposal process is designed to be inclusive, to encourage submission of meritorious ideas. Only a brief narrative is required, covered by a title page and a budget sheet. But the task of composing the preliminary proposal is not an easy one, and its quality will determine whether an applicant is invited to prepare a final proposal. Of those proposals invited into the final round of the competition (15-20%), FIPSE is able to fund one in every three or four. Although the Comprehensive Program is certainly competitive, applicants new to federal grantsmanship should not be discouraged. Almost half of FIPSE's current project directors have never before directed a federal grant, and only one in ten has previously been in charge of a FIPSE project. About one-quarter of each year's awards go to applicants who did not receive a grant on their first attempt, but who used the external reviews and conversations with FIPSE staff to prepare an improved proposal in a subsequent year.

FIPSE is a federal program and therefore takes a national perspective in its grantmaking. Both the importance of a project and the innovation represented by its proposed solution are therefore considered in relation to the needs of the postsecondary community as a whole. Applicants are advised to describe the problem or opportunity they wish to address in both its local and national contexts. Is it common to a number of other postsecondary institutions besides your own? Does it affect a substantial number of students at those institutions? If it affects a relatively small number, is the problem so serious that it jeopardizes their ability to succeed in postsecondary education, or the opportunity so great that it can transform their learning?

¹This program information is intended to aid applicants in applying for assistance under this competition. Nothing in this application package is intended to impose any paperwork, application content, reporting, or grantee performance requirement beyond those specifically imposed under the statute and regulations governing the competition.

Model programs addressing many common issues of postsecondary reform already exist. Some have been developed with the support of FIPSE or other funding agencies; many others were implemented without any outside grant support. Applicants are encouraged to begin their search for solutions by examining what others have done to address the issue or problem of concern, and to adapt appropriate current models wherever possible. It is when your research indicates that there are no appropriate models, or that current models can be substantially improved, that you should consider an application to FIPSE. We will welcome your ideas.

FIPSE's World Wide Web site (<http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE>) contains information resources that would be useful to a prospective applicant in developing a proposal. One of these is *Lessons Learned*, an occasional FIPSE publication, containing descriptions and results of many well evaluated FIPSE projects. The website also has descriptions of all currently funded projects, evaluation information and suggestions, material on other competitions, and funding advice from FIPSE program officers.

Prospective applicants should note that, although we do not review draft proposals, FIPSE program officers are happy to discuss project ideas by telephone or in person, particularly in the summer and fall before the preliminary proposal stage begins. Call the FIPSE office to set up an appointment.

The Review Process

In order to evaluate efficiently a broad range of proposals, the Comprehensive Program's review process consists of two stages—the first involving the preliminary proposal (a five-page, double-spaced narrative and a summary budget), and the second involving the final proposal (a twenty-five-page, double-spaced narrative, a budget, and a budget narrative).

Preliminary Proposals. Preliminary proposals are first examined by a group of external reviewers, identified each year from among faculty, administrators, or other professionals across the country, and chosen for their understanding of a broad range of issues in postsecondary education. A new group of readers is selected each year. Staff then carefully consider both the proposal and the reader reviews, and recommend which applicants should be invited to submit final proposals.

Your preliminary proposal should give external reviewers and staff a concrete understanding of the problem you are addressing and the solutions you propose, including a brief description of how you will evaluate the results. As noted above, it should be clear how your project strategy differs from and improves upon current practice at your institution and elsewhere in the nation.

Applicants should note that, at the preliminary proposal stage, external reviewers may or may not be experts on the particular topics of your grant application. It is therefore important to write the proposal narrative for an audience of generalists, using clear, direct language and avoiding jargon, clichés, and acronyms whenever possible. Given the volume of submissions, the preliminary proposal narrative must be limited to five double-spaced pages, or approximately 1,250 words. We recommend that no appendices or letters of recommendation be submitted at this stage.

Final Proposals. If you are invited to submit a final proposal, a FIPSE program officer will discuss with you by telephone both the external reviewers' and the staff's reactions to your preliminary application, and will remain available to answer questions and offer suggestions to assist you in strengthening the final proposal.

Final proposals are also read by at least two outside reviewers, including specialists in your subject. Additional experts may review proposals when technical questions arise, and FIPSE's National Board may discuss them. FIPSE staff then carefully read and discuss the proposals and the external reviews. Project directors of the most competitive applications are telephoned to clarify information about their projects. Staff may also contact others who know the applicant's work and plans, or who will be affected by the project.

Again at the final proposal stage, it is important to present your ideas in clear language that will help readers to understand precisely what you intend to do and how you will do it. Your final proposal narrative should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages, or approximately 6,250 words.

To ensure that all applicants enjoy the same opportunity to present their ideas, please conform to the page limitations noted above, use minimum 1-inch margins, and avoid font sizes smaller than 11 points.

Selection Criteria

Our intent in this section is to help applicants understand how the selection criteria are applied during the preliminary and final review stages. FIPSE does not separate proposals rigidly by types of activities, sectors of postsecondary education or other fixed categories, nor does it assign specific amounts of its budget to the priority areas described in the Agenda for Improvement. Instead, in our desire to identify the most significant issues and feasible plans, we compare each proposal to all others, using the criteria described below.

Each selection criterion is presented in bold type, and followed by a discussion of how it applies to the competition. The external readers and staff reviewers of your proposal use these criteria to guide their reviews at both stages of the Comprehensive Program competition, so it is in your interest to be familiar with them. The final decision on an application is based on an overall assessment of the extent to which it satisfactorily addresses all the selection criteria, which are weighted equally.

Preliminary proposals will be considered according to the following criteria, weighted equally:

1) The need for the project, as determined by the following factors:

- a) the magnitude or severity of the problem addressed by the project; and
- b) the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the project.

You should describe the nature and magnitude of the problem or opportunity you wish to address, in both its local setting and a national context. The Agenda for Improvement in this booklet identifies some areas of needed reform, but you may choose to focus on a topic not specifically mentioned in these guidelines, or you may choose to address more than one topic in a single project.

How central is the problem you have identified to your institution's vitality or the effectiveness of your educational services? Does the same problem affect other institutions around the country? Have attempts to remedy the situation been made by you or by others in the past, and with what results? What will be the local and national consequences of a successful completion of your project? Are other institutions or organizations likely to benefit or learn from your experience in ways that would enable them to improve their own programs and services?

Note that FIPSE does not support basic research; rather, its focus is on implementation projects designed to test new approaches to improvement and reform.

2) The significance of the project, as determined by the following factors:

- a) the potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies;
- b) the extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies;
- c) the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement; and
- d) the potential replicability of the proposed project, including its potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

Reviewers will appreciate any evidence you can include to illustrate how your project differs from and improves upon previous efforts. Describe the potential contribution of your project to increasing the postsecondary community's knowledge about effective reform strategies, and the likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from it. It is the applicant's responsibility to set a context within which reviewers can assess the project's importance to postsecondary education reform.

Directly or indirectly, learners should be the principal beneficiaries of your project. This means, for example, that faculty development proposals should

articulate the relationship between what the faculty will experience and what their students will learn. Our focus on the learner also means that FIPSE is especially interested in evaluation plans that assess projects in terms of their consequences for student learning.

FIPSE seeks to make the most of its limited funds by supporting projects that can become models for others in postsecondary education. Applicants should discuss the potential replicability of the proposed project, and its potential for implementation elsewhere. Before a project can become a model, however, its proponents must be able to prove that it has achieved its aims in its original setting. That is why a solid evaluation plan, one that focuses as much as possible on precisely how the project has helped students to become better educated, is an essential component of FIPSE projects.

Keep in mind that, if your project activities are heavily dependent on external funding, it will be very difficult for other institutions to adapt them on their own, and this may reduce the potential impact of your project.

3) The quality of the project's design, as determined by the extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Your strategies should be carefully designed to address the central causes of the problem you are addressing, based on your own research and experience, and based on previous experiments by others. Scatter-shot approaches to vaguely-defined problems make poor prospects for funding.

4) The quality of the project's evaluation, as determined by the extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

Evaluation should be an important part of your project planning, and your preliminary proposal should include a brief description of how you intend to document the activities and results of your project. (In the final proposal we ask for a specific section on evaluation in which you state your objectives clearly and present the details of your evaluation design.)

Final proposals will be considered in light of the above criteria and their factors and the following additional ones, all weighted equally:

5) The quality of the project's design, as determined by the following *additional* factors:

a) the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable; and

b) the extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

Your narrative should offer reviewers a clear description of who will do what, when, where, why, and with what anticipated results. The project's goals and objectives should be clearly identified and measurable.

All proposed projects should include plans for disseminating their findings. There are many ways of informing others of a project's results, and of helping others make use of your experience. In reviewing plans for dissemination or adaptation, we ask whether the methods proposed are appropriate for the project in question and whether they improve upon methods used elsewhere.

Some projects are themselves efforts to disseminate proven approaches to reform. If the central purpose of your project is dissemination, please review the discussion under "Dissemination of Successful Innovations" in the Agenda for Improvement section of this application package.

6) The quality of the project evaluation, as determined by the following *additional* factors:

- a) the extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project; and
- b) the extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

Formative evaluation can help you manage your project more effectively, and a strong summative evaluation, especially if it documents the project's effects on the learner, can turn a successful project into a national model for improvement in postsecondary education. As you develop your evaluation plan, place yourself in the position of the recipient of your final evaluation report. What would count as solid quantitative and qualitative evidence that your project had succeeded, or failed? It may be difficult, within the term of the grant, to assess accomplishment of long-range objectives, but you should be able to identify some short-term indicators. Bear in mind that the goals of local institutionalization and wider impact may well elude you unless you can provide solid evidence that your project is achieving its aims. Developing such evidence should not be put off until the last stages of a project. It must be a consideration from the design stage onward.

FIPSE provides a short bibliography of books and articles on program evaluation to assist you with evaluation design. These references clarify formative and summative evaluation. They address evidence, measurement, and sampling questions, and discuss the immediate and long-range outcomes you can expect, based on your project objectives. This bibliography is available on FIPSE's website, or by telephone or mail request to the FIPSE office.

7) The quality of the management plan, as determined by the plan's adequacy to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

8) The quality of project personnel, as determined by the following factors:

a) the qualifications, including training and experience, of key project personnel; and

b) the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

The qualifications of key personnel, including the project director and any consultants or subcontractors, should be briefly outlined in an appendix to the final proposal. Please note that a standard curriculum vitae is usually not appropriate for this purpose. What is needed is a brief (two pages maximum) narrative summary of each individual's background, with a special focus on those experiences related to the topic of your application.

9) The adequacy of resources for the proposed project, as determined by the following factors:

a) the extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project;

b) the extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project;

c) the demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

d) the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant organization; and

e) the potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

It should be clear that you have carefully allocated appropriate resources and personnel for the tasks and activities described in your proposal. Even at the preliminary proposal stage, it is in the applicant's best interest to prepare an estimated budget carefully. There is no point in jeopardizing the success of the project through insufficient allocation of funds; nor is it helpful to over-estimate its costs to the host institution or to FIPSE. A detailed budget and justification attached to your final proposal should itemize the support you request from FIPSE and the support you expect to obtain from sources other than FIPSE.

FIPSE cannot purchase facilities and it rarely supports equipment purchases. These costs should be included in your institutional contribution.

FIPSE is especially interested in projects designed to be cost-effective, to increase the likelihood that successful efforts may be continued beyond the period of a FIPSE grant, and to be replicated by others. But cost-effectiveness must not imply insufficient resources to accomplish the project's goals and objectives. Costs should be allocated, and will be judged, in comparison to the scope of the project and the requirements for achieving its objectives.

It is important to provide evidence that the plans you propose have the support of those who will authorize them, those who will carry them out, and those who

will be affected by them. At the preliminary proposal stage, it is enough to note such support in your narrative. Final proposals should include, in an appendix, letters of commitment and support from senior administrators of the host institution, any partners in the project, and, if desired, national experts on the issues addressed in the proposal. Applicants are advised that the quality of letters of support is important, not their quantity.

The applicant institution and any partners should support the project both philosophically and financially. Because FIPSE applicants are often seeking support that will develop or strengthen their own programs or capacities, we expect the host institution and its partners to make a significant commitment to the project in the form of direct cost sharing and low indirect cost rates. FIPSE does not specify a particular percentage of cost-sharing or an indirect rate, however, because the rate proposed is taken as an indication of institutional commitment, and this may vary from institution to institution and from project to project. Some of our applicants request no indirect costs at all. As a reference point, FIPSE staff generally use the U.S. Department of Education training rate of eight percent (8%) of total direct costs as a basis for judgments about reasonable indirect costs.

FIPSE grants are generally used to support the start-up of new programs or activities that are intended to continue after a grant ends. When this is the case, your proposal should have a clear and convincing plan for long-term continuation of the project that includes explicit commitments from those who will be responsible for sustaining the activity. When long-term institutionalization of the project is the goal, it is often desirable to plan for an increasing share of institutional support with declining FIPSE support during the life of the grant.

Because issues of cost are often critical for institutionalization, proposals requiring grant dollars for student financial aid or equipment are rarely competitive. Instead we expect that projects requiring such funds will acquire the money from other sources. Grants cannot be used for the purchase of real property or for construction.

Submitting Your Proposal

The Comprehensive Program has a two-stage submission and review process. To be eligible to submit a final proposal and to qualify for funding consideration, all applicants must submit a preliminary proposal on or before January 26, 2001.

FIPSE will review the preliminary proposals and, by the end of March 2001, will mail notifications to applicants invited to submit final proposals. The list of applicants invited to the final stage of the competition will be posted on the FIPSE website (<<http://www.ed.gov/FIPSE/>>). Final proposals must be submitted on or before April 27, 2001.

The announced closing dates and procedures for guaranteeing timely submission will be strictly observed.

Applicants should also note that the closing date applies to both the date the application is mailed and the hand delivery date. A mailed application meets the requirements if it is mailed on or before the pertinent closing date and the required proof of mailing is provided. Proof of mailing may consist of one of the following: (a) a legible dated U.S. Postal Service postmark; (b) a legible receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; (c) a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier, or (d) any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary will *not* accept either of the following as proof of mailing: (1) a private metered postmark, or (2) a mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

Please use first class or express mail. (Overnight delivery is encouraged.) All applicants will receive acknowledgment notices upon receipt of preliminary and final proposals from the Application Control Center. If you do not receive an acknowledgment notice within six weeks of the closing date, please contact FIPSE using the address or phone number in the introduction to these guidelines.

Please wait the full six weeks before contacting us for an acknowledgment.

MAILING ADDRESS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PROPOSALS:

**FIPSE Comprehensive Program
ATTN: 84.116A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Room 3633, ROB-3
Washington, DC 20202-4725**

Submission Procedures for Preliminary Proposals:

Mailed Proposals: Proposals sent by mail must be mailed no later than January 26, 2001. First class mail should be used. Use the address above.

Hand Delivered Proposals: Preliminary proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays, at the Application Control Center, General Services Administration Building, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3633, Washington, D.C. Preapplications will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on January 26, 2001.

Number of Copies: All applicants must submit one (1) signed original and two (2) complete copies of the preliminary proposal. Each copy must be covered with a Title Page, ED 40-514 (included with these guidelines) or a reasonable facsimile. Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title Page itself.

Content: Preliminary proposals should be written clearly and concisely, and should include the following:

1. Title Page: Use Form ED 40-514 or a suitable facsimile to cover each copy of the proposal. At the preliminary stage, you need not complete items 1 and 2. Be sure your proposal abstract (item 8) is clear and concrete, as it will be used at several points in the review. See the Title Page Instructions for additional information.

2. Narrative: It should consist of no more than five double-spaced, numbered pages, or approximately 1,250 words and in font size no smaller than 11 point. Please review the selection criteria in the Guide to Proposal Development above. Although no standard outline is required, you should:

- Briefly describe the problem you intend to address and the objectives of your project.
- State what you propose to do about it.
- Explain how your strategy would improve upon present practice, locally and nationally.
- Describe how you plan to evaluate whether you have achieved your goals.

3. Budget Summary: No detailed breakdowns or justifications are required at the preliminary stage, but you should carefully estimate major expenditures, as indicated on the budget page. Proposals that request equipment funds, student financial assistance monies, or high indirect costs are rarely competitive. FIPSE cannot support construction costs, nor can it purchase facilities.

4. Appendices: We generally recommend that no appendices be included with preliminary proposals; however, it is occasionally essential to include a small amount (no more than one or two pages) of information about the institution, problem, or strategy as an appendix. Unless this appendix is short, it will not

be included in the review process. Please do not submit resumes or letters of support at this stage.

Upon receiving your preliminary proposal, the Application Control Center will mail you an acknowledgment that will include the reference number (PR/Award Number) that has been assigned to your application. It will begin with "P116A", followed by a six-digit number. Always mention the complete PR/Award number in your communications with FIPSE.

Submission Procedures for Final Proposals:

Mailed Proposals: Proposals sent by mail must be mailed no later than April 27, 2001.

Hand Delivered Proposals: Hand delivered proposals will be accepted daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time except Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays, at the Application Control Center, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Room 3633, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D.C. Proposals will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on April 27, 2001.

Number of Copies: All applicants must submit one (1) signed original and two (2) complete copies of the final proposal, although four (4) copies are requested. Each proposal copy must be covered with a Title Page, Form ED 40-5141, or a reasonable facsimile. Applicants are also requested to submit three (3) additional copies of the Title Page itself.

Content: Proposals should be concise and clearly written, and should include the following:

1. Title Page: Use Form ED 40-514 or a suitable facsimile to cover each proposal copy. Please include a brief abstract of your project in the space provided. Additional instructions are found in the Title Page Instructions.

2. Abstract: Attach a one-page doubled-spaced abstract following the Title Page (this is in addition to the abstract requested on the Title Page itself). The abstract should identify the problem or opportunity being addressed, the proposed project activities, and their intended outcomes. It should also include a concise summary of what is innovative about the project.

3. Proposal Narrative: Please review the selection criteria described in these guidelines. While FIPSE does not prescribe a standard outline for all applicants, in no more than 25 double-spaced, numbered pages, or approximately 6,250 words and in font size no smaller than 11 point, you should: (1) identify the issue or problem you are addressing and the project's objectives; (2) describe the proposed strategies and how they improve existing practice; (3) describe your institution's capacity and commitment to the project; and (4) discuss your plans for evaluation and dissemination. If someone other than the named project director was the principal writer of the proposal, please include his or her name, title and affiliation at the end of the narrative.

4. Budget summary and detailed budget: Use the one-page budget summary included with these guidelines or a suitable facsimile to present a complete budget. In addition, provide a detailed budget using the same line items used in

the budget summary and a separate narrative budget justification. Provide a detailed line-item budget for each year of the project. The narrative should explain: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries and wages, including annual salary or hourly wage rate and percentage of staff time; employee benefits per person, including rates and percentage of staff time; employee travel per person/per trip; consultants and subcontracts, including non-employee travel; materials and supplies; other costs, including printing and equipment rental; indirect costs; (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities; and (3) the costs of evaluation. Your detailed budget should also include a detailed breakdown of institutional and other support for the project.

5. *Appendices:* (a) “Key Project Personnel”: Please provide a brief summary (two pages) of the background and experience of key project staff as they relate to the specific project activities you are proposing. Letters of support and commitment from appropriate officials at the sponsoring institution and project partners are also welcomed. Do not attach any other appendices or information unless they are directly relevant to your project. Appendices must be attached to all copies of the final proposal to be included in the review. (b) “Equitable Access and Participation”: Sectional 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requires each applicant to include in its application a description of proposed steps to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally assisted program. Each application should include this description in a clearly identified appendix. The statute, which allows applicants discretion in developing the required description, highlights six types of barriers that can impeded equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. You may use local circumstances to determine the extent to which these or other barriers prevent equitable participation by students, faculty, or other relevant audiences. Your description should be a succinct description of how you plan to address any barriers.

6. *Assurances and Certifications:* Please sign and include the certifications. When your institutional representative signs the Title Page, the applicant is certifying that it will comply with the assurances contained in these guidelines.

Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs (Executive Order 12372):

This competition is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, and the regulations in 34 CFR 79. The objective of the order is to foster a Federal and State intergovernmental coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance. Applicants are directed to the appropriate State single point of contact to comply with the State’s procedures under this Executive Order. A list of these contacts is available at <http://www.sheeo.org/about-sheeo/agencies.htm>.

THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

TITLE PAGE

Check one: Preliminary Proposal _____ Final Proposal _____

This application should be sent to:

No. 84.116A

U.S. Department of Education

Application Control Center

Room 3633, ROB-3

Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

1. Application Number

2. D-U-N-S Number:

Employer Identification No.:

3. Project Director (Name and Mailing Address)

4. Institutional Information

Highest Degree Awarded:

_____ Two-year

_____ Four-Year

_____ Graduate

_____ Doctorate

_____ Non-degree granting

Type:

_____ Public

_____ Private

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

5. Federal Funds Requested:

6. Duration of Project:

1st Year _____

2nd Year (if applicable) _____

3rd Year (if applicable) _____

Total Amount: _____

Starting Date _____

Ending Date _____

Total No. of Months _____

7. Proposal Title

8. Brief Abstract of Proposal (*DO NOT LEAVE THIS BLANK*)

9. Legal Applicant: (Name and Mailing Address)

10. Population Directly Benefiting from the Project:

Congressional District of the Applicant Institution:

11. Certification by Authorizing Official

The applicant certifies to the best of his/her knowledge and belief that the data in this application are true and correct, that the filing of the application has been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant, and that the applicant will comply with the attached assurances if assistance is approved.

Print Name

Title

Phone

Signature

Date

Instructions for Completing Title Page (Form ED 40-514)

Paperwork Burden Statement: According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-514. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 11 hours per response for preliminary proposals and 20 hours per response for full proposals, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of this time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: FIPSE; U.S. Department of Education; 8th Floor; 1990 K. Street, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20006-8544.

Please note: Item 1 and the Congressional District in Item 10 need be completed only at the final proposal stage.

Item 1. Application Number: Leave blank. An application number will be assigned to your proposal by the Application Control Center.

Item 2. D-U-N-S Number: The D-U-N-S Number is assigned to organizations by Dun & Bradstreet. If you do not know your D-U-N-S Number, call the toll-free telephone number maintained by Dun & Bradstreet: 800-333-0505 (Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. Eastern time). **Employer Identification Number:** Enter the 9-digit number assigned to your organization for reporting to the Internal Revenue Service. It is also called the Federal Identification Number and can be obtained from your business office. If you do not have one, your business office should contact the Internal Revenue Service. **NOTE:** No grant can be awarded without these two numbers.

Item 3. Project Director: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the designated Project Director. If no one has been selected, so indicate and enter the name of the person who can be contacted to discuss the programmatic aspects of the project. *NOTE: The name and address listed here will be used to mail proposal status notifications. Do not forget to include the telephone number and e-mail address. Both this address and the Legal Applicant address (Item 9) should be fully completed.*

Item 4. Institutional Information: Check the appropriate spaces to indicate both the type of control and the highest degree level granted by the applicant institution or organization.

Item 5. Federal Funds Requested: Enter the amount of Federal funds being requested from FIPSE in the first, second, and third years of the project. Under "Total Amount" enter the cumulative amount requested for the life of the project.

Item 6. Duration of Project: Enter the beginning date of the project. Enter the ending date and the total number of months covered. Comprehensive Program projects can be proposed for one, two, or three years of funding.

Item 7. Proposal Title: Self-explanatory.

Item 8. Brief Abstract of Proposal: This description should be concise and confined to the space provided, but in no case should you leave this space blank.

Item 9. Legal Applicant: Enter the name and complete mailing address of the nonprofit institution or agency which will serve as the legal applicant (fiscal agent). When more than one institution or agency is involved, enter the name of the one which will be responsible for budget control. *Official notifications of grant awards are sent to this address.* Remember to complete this section fully.

Item 10. Population Directly Benefiting from the Project: Please be specific and include both the approximate number to be benefited and their general characteristics (e.g. "200 non-traditional students").

Item 11. Certification by Authorizing Official: Enter the name, title, and phone number of the official who has the authority both to commit the organization to accept Federal funding and to execute the proposed project. Submit the original ink-signed copy of the authorizing official's signature.

Budget Summary*

A. Budget Items Requested from FIPSE

Year 1

Year 2

Year 3

Direct Costs:

1. Salaries & Wages (professional & clerical employees)

\$

2. Employee Benefits

3. Travel (employees only)

4. Equipment (purchase)

5. Materials and Supplies

6. Consultants and Contracts (including any travel)

7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)

Total Direct Costs (add 1-7 above):

Indirect Costs:

Total Requested from FIPSE:

\$

(These figures should appear on the title page)

B. Project Costs Not Requested from FIPSE

(institutional and other support):

1. Salaries & Wages (professional & clerical employees)

\$

2. Employee Benefits

3. Travel (employees only)

4. Equipment (purchase)

5. Materials and Supplies

6. Consultants and Contracts (including any travel)

7. Other (equipment rental, printing, etc.)

Total Direct Costs (add 1-7 above):

Indirect Costs:

Total Institutional and Other Support:

\$

*Budget items, including institutional support figures, must be detailed in the budget narrative of the final proposal.

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies that it will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, as they relate to the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this Federally assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been dully adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.
2. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of the Act, no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance and will immediately take any measures necessary to effect this agreement.
3. It will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) prohibiting employment discrimination where (1) the primary purpose of a grant is to provide employment or (2) discriminatory employment practices will result in unequal treatment of persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity.
4. It will comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.
5. It will comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.
6. It will comply with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq., which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance.
7. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and Federally-assisted programs.
8. It will comply with provisions of the Hatch Act which limit the political activity of employees.
9. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, as they apply to hospital and educational institution employees of State and local governments.
10. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.
11. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General through any authorized representative the access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.
12. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.
13. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.
14. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, P.L. 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on or after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.
15. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such property.

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 34 CFR Part 82, ? New Restrictions on Lobbying,? and 34 CFR Part 85, ? Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).? The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Education determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 34 CFR Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

- (a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;
- (b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, ? Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,? in accordance with its instructions;
- (c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.105 and 85.110--

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

- (a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;
- (b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgement rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;
- (c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and
- (d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transaction (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610 -

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

- (a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;
- (b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about-
 - (1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
 - (2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
 - (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
 - (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;
- (c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);
- (d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will-

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted-

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 CFR Part 85, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 CFR Part 85, Sections 85.605 and 85.610-

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Director, Grants Policy and Oversight Staff, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W. (Room 3652, GSA Regional Office Building No. 3), Washington, DC 20202-4248. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

**DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE
(GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)**

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND / OR PROJECT NAME
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

USE THIS CHECKLIST IN PREPARING YOUR APPLICATION PACKAGE

Preliminary and Final Proposals:

_____ Title page has been completed according to the instructions in this booklet.

_____ Title page has been signed and dated by an authorized official and the signed original has been included.

_____ Each proposal copy has been stapled or otherwise fastened (no binders or folders) with a title page on top of each copy.

Include in Your Proposal Package:

Preliminary Proposal

_____ One (1) original plus two (2) copies of the entire proposal. Each copy should be consecutively numbered and include the following:

- ☐ signed title page, on top
- ☐ proposal narrative, not to exceed five (5) double-spaced pages
- ☐ completed 1-page budget summary

_____ Three (3) additional copies of the title page.

Preliminary proposals must be postmarked or hand-delivered by January 26, 2001.

Final Proposal

_____ One (1) original plus two (2) copies of the entire proposal. (Two (2) additional copies are also requested but not required.) Each copy should be consecutively numbered and include the following:

- ☐ signed title page, on top
- ☐ one-page abstract of the proposed project
- ☐ proposal narrative, not to exceed twenty-five (25) double-spaced pages
- ☐ completed 1-page budget summary and separate detailed budget and narrative
- ☐ appendix including the Key Project Personnel summary, the Equitable Access Statement, and any letters of support
- ☐ signed certification pages from the application booklet and assurances page

_____ Three (3) additional copies of the title page

Final Proposals must be postmarked or hand-delivered by April 27, 2001.

MAILING ADDRESS FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PROPOSALS:

**FIPSE Comprehensive Program
ATTN: 84.116A
U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Room 3633, ROB-3
Washington, DC 20202-4725**